

REMARKS

Status of Application

Claims 1-12 were pending in this application. In the Office Action mailed June 24, 2009, claims 1-12 were rejected.

By this amendment, claims 1-12 are pending as currently amended or previously presented. No new matter is introduced by these amendments, which are fully supported by the specification.

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-12.

Applicant reserves the right to prosecute any withdrawn, cancelled, or non-elected claims and/or subject matter in separate applications.

Objections to Drawings

Applicants note that previous objections to the drawings were not maintained in the Office Action mailed January 5, 2009. Applicants respectfully submit that the drawings provide clarity for the reference characters “101” and “201” because Figs. 2 and 4 refer to different inventive arrangements of pixels and circuits. The pixels of Fig. 2 are in an arrangement different from the pixels of Fig. 4, therefore it is appropriate to use different reference characters for the pixels of the different inventive arrangements. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner specifically note acceptance of the drawings.

Specification

Applicants respectfully decline to add headings to the specification as these are suggested, but are not a requirement for patentability in accordance with MPEP § 608.01(a).

Claim Objections

Amendment of claim 1 to read “the activation signals” has been submitted. Thus, these objections may be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 11 and 12 were rejected as anticipated by Kim (US 6,362,643). In brief, among other things, the Examiner stated, in regard to claim 1, that Kim discloses an array of pixels, an addressing circuit that with an activation signal that is sequentially fed, where the addressing circuit has driver units, connecting lines, internal clock lines, and a read out line.

Applicants' respectfully submit that claim 1 as amended clarifies the claimed invention with respect to the super pixel aspect of the array. Claim 1 is not anticipated by Kim because Kim does not disclose super pixels as described in Applicants' claim 1. For example, the Examiner pointed to col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 25, and col. 7, lines 7-37 of Kim for a description of the array. (See Office Action at page 4-5) However, this disclosure refers to an 'n' by 'm' array that is addressed row by row (GL1 through GLn) and column by column (DL1 through DLm). (See Kim, col. 4, lines 35-53, col. 4, lines 44-46, and Fig. 2) Thus, this array requires a pair of addressing lines to each unit "CM" and "LCC," which refers to a TFT and liquid crystal cell, respectively. (*Id.*)

To the contrary, Applicants' invention of claim 1 utilizes a super pixel in which "one external trigger line routed to the first pixel of each super pixel and an addressing circuit via which an activation signal can be *sequentially fed to each individual electronic unit* of the super pixel, wherein the addressing circuit of the super pixel contains the following components: ... internal clock lines within each super pixel that *connect the driver unit of each pixel of the super pixel serially to one another* for clocking the trigger and the activation signals." (See claim 1 as amended) Thus, Kim does not disclose every element of Applicants' invention.

Claims 2-12 depend from claim 1 and are not anticipated for the same reasons.

Thus, these rejections can be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claim 2 was rejected as unpatentable over Kim in view of Lee (6,421,038). Claim 9 was rejected as unpatentable over Kim in view of Suzuki (2001-0013853). Claims 6 and 10 were rejected as unpatentable over Kim in view of "Applicant Admitted Prior Art" (AAPA).

For each of these rejections, the Examiner relied on Kim for recitation of the array arrangement.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not provided a *prima facie* case for obviousness because Kim does not describe all the limitations of Applicants' array arrangement as claimed in claim 1. Applicants' invention requires fewer lines for the super pixel addressing circuit than in a row by row and column by column circuit, and has corresponding advantages. (See specification at page 3, lines 6-18) The disclosure missing in Kim is not provided in the references of record.

Thus, claims 2, 6, 9 and 10 are patentable over Kim, Lee, Suzuki and AAPA, taken alone or in any combination.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-12 as amended distinguish patentably from the references of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-12.

Should any questions remain, Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Richard R. Eckman /

Richard R. Eckman
Reg. No. 42,504
Attorney for Applicant
For Christopher M. Ries, Reg. No. 45,799
Philips Intellectual Property and Standards
345 Scarborough Road
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001 USA
Telephone: 914-333-9632